



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/743,104	01/16/2001	Hiroshi Kamakura	108099	6029

25944 7590 08/11/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/743,104	KAMAKURA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/25/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on 17 May 2006 have been received and entered. The applicant has cancelled claims 8-10 and 12-17. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11 as amended are pending in the application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “A design of multimedia collaboration system for seminar type collaborative learning”, Kimura et al. (hereinafter Kimura) and Larson et al. U.S. Patent 5,907,324 (hereinafter “Larson”).

Referring to claim 1, Kimura teaches a system comprising a communication interface section that receives supplied data (information created by a presenter using a presentation sheet is supplied to be transmitted to participants) (Kimura: top of page 1 and pages 11 and 20 of the attached translation), a generation unit that generates meeting data (transmitting the presenter's presentation sheets to the seminar participants and recording the content of the presentation) (Kimura: pages 10-12 and 20 of the attached translation); a conversion unit including a virtual machine that converts the received supplied-data into a data format which allows the generation unit to generate the meeting data (the system is implemented as Java Applets and executed in

WWW browsers to deal with multi platform conversion and integration of the seminar's presentation on the client, or participants' computers) (Kimura: pages 5 and 23 of the attached translation); and a data control unit that stores the supplied-data, converted by the conversion unit, while managing the supplied-data in units of data associated with respective data supply apparatuses into a storage unit in which particular presentation data is stored (presentation data supplied from presenters are stored in databases) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation), and reading meeting data including at least a part of the supplied-data and the presentation data from the storage unit in accordance with a reproduction command indicating reproduction in units of data associated with the data supply apparatus, and a reproduction unit that reproduces the meeting data read (in response to commands, or requests from participant clients, the database of stored presentation data is read and the read presentation data transmitted to the clients) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation). This is further disclosed on pages 12-14 and bottom of page 16 of the attached translation. However, Kimura fails to explicitly teach the generated meeting data are identified by labels for respective particular units of a meeting.

Larson teaches a system that facilitates meetings, i.e. conferences, similar to that of Kimura. In addition, Larson further teaches identifying meeting data by labels for respective particular units of a meeting (each session profile of the conference have a unique name or identifier) (Larson: column 1, lines 57-67, column 2, lines 57-67 and column 6, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kimura and Larson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for converting meeting data of Kimura to include the identification of meeting data by labels taught by Larson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide users with a persistent and efficient

data structure that allows users to record many more characteristics and parameters of a conference and retrieve the recorded information fast and easily.

Referring to claim 2, Kimura, as modified, teach the data supply apparatus being a server device (presentation server and HTTP server) (Kimura: pages 5, 14, 16 and 19-20 of the attached translation), and the supplied-data comprising a component object serving as a part of a program for generating the meeting data (presenters supply presentation data used to generate the presentation to be sent to participants, i.e. the HTML used by the presentation sheets, drawings and tables) (Kimura: pages 19-20 of the attached translation), and the generation unit generating the program for generating meeting data in accordance with the received component object and generating the meeting data using the program (using the HTML transmitted from the presenter, the presentation is created and transmitted to the participants) (Kimura: pages 19-20 of the attached translation).

Referring to claim 3, Kimura, as modified, teach the supplied-data comprising at least one of image data for displaying the meeting data and control data for controlling the displaying of the meeting data (control data such as HTML data and image data such as drawings and tables are supplied by the presenter) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation), the meeting data generating apparatus further comprising a display unit that displays the meeting data in accordance with the image data and a control unit that controls the displaying of the meeting data in accordance with the control data (displaying meeting data, i.e. transmitting the created presentation, including image data such as drawings and tables, to the participants to be viewed on their display screen, and controlling the display of such data, i.e. notification of page

switching information and transmission of seminar control commands to the participants by a moderator) (Kimura: pages 19-20 of the attached translation) .

Referring to claim 5, Kimura, as modified, teach the reproduction unit reproducing the meeting data stored in the storage unit, in units of data associated with the data supply apparatus in accordance with the reproduction command (in response to commands, or requests from participant clients, the database of stored presentation data is read and the read presentation data transmitted to the clients) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation).

Referring to claim 6, Kimura, as modified, teach an image-recording unit that records an image of a meeting scene (presentation information are recorded) (Kimura: pages 1 and 14 of the attached translation), the data control unit storing image data obtained as a result of a recording of the meeting scene in the storage unit as a part of the meeting data, in predetermined units of data (recorded presentations from the presenters are stored in databases) (Kimura: pages 14 and 20 of the attached translation), and the reproduction unit reproducing the meeting data stored in the storage unit, in predetermined units of data in accordance with the reproduction command (in response to commands, or requests from participant clients, the database of stored presentation data is read and the read presentation data transmitted to the clients) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation).

Referring to claim 7, Kimura, as modified, teach the meeting data generating apparatus further comprising a data control unit that stores the supplied-data, converted by the conversion unit, while managing the supplied-data in units of data associated with respective data supply apparatuses into the storage unit in which particular presentation data is stored (control data such as HTML data and image data such as drawings and tables supplied by the presenter are stored in

databases) (Kimura: pages 14 and 20 of the attached translation), reading meeting data including at least a part of the supplied-data and the presentation data from the storage unit in accordance with a reproduction command indicating reproduction in units of data associated with the processing apparatus (in response to commands, or requests from participant clients, the database of stored presentation data is read) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation), and the communication interface section transmitting the read meeting data to the data supply apparatuses (the data read from the databases are transmitted to connected client computers) (Kimura: page 20 of the attached translation).

Referring to claim 11, Kimura teaches an information storage medium comprising interpretation information including the virtual machine implemented therein, for interpreting received supplied-data using the virtual machine (the system is implemented as Java Applets and executed in WWW browsers to interpret and integrate the seminar's presentation on a plurality of client computers while solving the problem of multi platform conversion) (Kimura: pages 5 and 23 of the attached translation); and generation information for generating the meeting data based on an interpretation result (creating a presentation from presentation data received and integrated, the created presentation is subsequently transmitted to the participants for viewing) (Kimura: pages 10-12 and 20 of the attached translation). This is further disclosed on pages 12-14 and bottom of page 16 of the attached translation. However, Kimura fails to explicitly teach the generated meeting data are identified by labels for respective particular units of a meeting. Larson teaches a system that facilitates meetings, i.e. conferences similar to that of Kimura. In addition, Larson further teaches identifying meeting data by labels for respective particular units of a meeting (each session profile of the conference have a unique name or identifier) (Larson:

column 1, lines 57-67, column 2, lines 57-67 and column 6, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kimura and Larson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for converting meeting data of Kimura to include the identification of meeting data by labels taught by Larson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide users with a persistent and efficient data structure that allows users to record many more characteristics and parameters of a conference and retrieve the recorded information fast and easily.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments filed 17 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

4. The applicant argues that the motivation reported in the office action is not supported by objective evidence or record because Larson teaches retrieving conference parameters and automatically resuming a prior conference, still in session, while Kimura teaches recording a session for later viewing, after termination of the conference; thus, the motivation provided is directed towards minimizing the efforts to resume a pre-existing conference while Kimura's inventive intent is to archive the data for subsequent viewing, after the participants have terminated the conferences. The respectfully disagrees. Larson teaches that the user can store information related to a conference; this information can also be retrieved and viewed at a later time. Although Larson does not explicitly state that the parameters can be viewed at the specific later time of after the conference has ended, Larson does teach that the parameters can be easily



accessed, *after* the conference characteristics has been saved (column 2, lines 63-67). Similarly, Kimura teaches viewing conference data *after* it as been saved (bottom of pages 3 and 11). Therefore, the motivation provided by Larson is directed towards allowing users to quickly and easily access saved conference data after it has been stored, which is directly related to the inventive intent of Kimura for viewing conference data after it has been saved. In view of the above arguments, the examiner respectfully asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in they art to combine the teachings of Kimura and Larson.

5. Furthermore, the applicant argues that each reference teaches the use of a single operating system, and does not teach the ability to operate in a multiplicity of operating systems, or an ability to convert data between various operating systems. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "ability to operate in a multiplicity of operating systems", or "an ability to convert data between the various operating systems") are not explicitly recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, the examiner respectfully argues that Kimura teaches that the invention can be combined with other systems (page 5 of Kimura recites that the conference system "enables the connection with different models"). Furthermore, both Kimura and Larson teach that the system operates on browsers (page 5 of Kimura and column 9, lines 35-47 of Larson). Therefore, the examiner respectfully argues that both inventions are implemented on browsers and can be connected with other systems/models.

Art Unit: 2173

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

6. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

  
**KIEU D. VU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**